For the Northern District of California

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		E-FILED on 6-8-2006
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
11		
12	ISMART INTERNATIONAL LIMITED, an India Company,	No. C-04-03114 RMW
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR ORDER
14	V.	SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
15	I-DOCSECURE, LLC, a California Limited	AMEND COMPLAINT
16	Liability Company; E-NETSECURE SERVICES, INC., a California Corporation;	[Re Docket Nos. 193, 195]
17	INTEGRITY DATA APPLICATIONS CONSULTING, LLC, a California Limited	
18	Liability Company; JOSEPH BAGGIO, an individual; and JONATHAN BALZORA, an	
19	individual,,	
20	Defendants.	
21		_
22	Plaintiff iSmart International Limited moves for an order shortening time on its pending	
23	motion for leave to amend its complaint. Plaintiff seeks to add one new party and several new	
24	causes of action. Plaintiff's main justification for an expedited briefing schedule appears to be the	

facts that the current deadline for disclosure of expert witnesses is June 16 and the close of non-expert discovery is June 28. The defendants oppose the motion but state that they "are willing to discuss modification" of the discovery schedule. Docket no. 195 at 3.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT—No. C-04-03114 RMW JAH

Case 5:04-cv-03114-RMW Document 198 Filed 06/08/06 Page 2 of 3

If the court grants plaintiff's motion for leave to amend, modification of the current schedule			
for the case may well be appropriate, but such modification will be moot if the court denies the			
motion. Any potential prejudice to plaintiff can be cured by modification of the case schedule if			
warranted; prejudice to the defendants from having little time to respond to plaintiff's motion to			
amend cannot be easily cured. Plaintiff's motion to move forward the hearing date on its motion to			
amend is denied.			
DATED: 6/8/06 Romala M white			
RONALD M. WHYTE United States District Judge			

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT—No. C-04-03114 RMW JAH

JAH

1	Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:		
2	Counsel for Plaintiffs:		
3	Joseph Kouri Marc A. Koonin	joseph.kouri@sdma.com marc.koonin@sdma.com	
4	Counsel for Defendants:		
5	James Arthur Hughes Michael N. Edelman	jah@greenstamps.com michael.edelman@dechert.com	
6 7	Michael N. Edelman Robert T. Sullwold	michael.edelman@dechert.com	
8			
9	registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.		
10			
11			
12	Dated: <u>6-8-2006</u>	/s/ JH Chambers of Judge Whyte	
13		Chambers of Juage Whyte	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING ON	

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT—No. C-04-03114 RMW

3